

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
SOUTHERN DIVISION
No. 7:15-CV-229-D

PEARLINE SHAW JACKSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

NANCY A. BERRYHILL,
Acting Commissioner of Social Security,

Defendant.

ORDER

On January 23, 2017, Magistrate Judge Numbers issued a Memorandum and Recommendation (“M&R”) [D.E. 26]. In that M&R, Judge Numbers recommended that this court deny plaintiff’s motion for judgment on the pleadings [D.E. 20], grant defendant’s motion for judgment on the pleadings [D.E. 23], and affirm defendant’s final decision. Neither party objected to the M&R.

“The Federal Magistrates Act requires a district court to make a de novo determination of those portions of the magistrate judge’s report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (emphasis, alteration, and quotation omitted); see 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). Absent a timely objection, “a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” Diamond, 416 F.3d at 315 (quotation omitted).

The court has reviewed the M&R, the record, and the briefs. The court is satisfied that there is no clear error on the face of the record. Accordingly, the court adopts the conclusions in the M&R [D.E. 26].

In sum, plaintiff's motion for judgment on the pleadings [D.E. 20] is DENIED, defendant's motion for judgment on the pleadings [D.E. 23] is GRANTED, defendant's final decision is AFFIRMED, and this action is DISMISSED. The clerk shall close the case.

SO ORDERED. This 19 day of February 2017.



JAMES C. DEVER III
Chief United States District Judge